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Abstract

The halogenation/alkylation procedure that has been proven to chemically and electrically passivate the Si(111) surface has been adapted for application to Ge(111). Removal of the Ge(111) surface oxide with 6–9 M HF(aq), followed by exposure to Br$_2$ vapor, then alkylmagnesium or alkyllithium reagents yields air stable surfaces with surface recombination velocities (SRVs) as low as 40 cm/sec$^{-1}$ at flat-band conditions. Surface charges with a density on the order of $10^{12}$ cm$^{-2}$ cause a negative surface potential of almost 300 mV in n-type CH$_3$-Ge(111) samples prepared with this method. The oxidized surface shows a strongly positive surface potential in atmospheric conditions. A negative surface potential is also present in CH$_3$-Si(111), but the wider bandgap prevents this from causing inversion conditions in extrinsic samples. Ge(111) surfaces alkylated with a larger organic group, such as ethyl or decyl, displayed a weaker surface potential and higher surface recombination velocity as the surface was brought near flat-band. Mercury contacts to alkylated n-type substrates form rectifying junctions with barrier heights of 0.6 ± 0.1 eV. Contacts to p-type substrates or to oxidized n-type substrates show no measurable rectification. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) confirms that the area concentration of surface-bound carbon on CH$_3$-Ge(111) surfaces is equal to that of CH$_3$-Si(111)
surfaces. Other passivation methods were less successful.

Every atop Ge atom of an ideal CH$_3$-Ge(111) should be capped and the Ge-C bonds should be directed normal to the surface plane. Infrared absorption spectroscopy (IRAS) of methyl-terminated surfaces prepared from HF-etched precursors did not display distinguishable absorption peaks, but if the Ge substrate is first treated with an anisotropic etch before the HF etch, IRAS confirms the methyl group orientation with the polarization-dependent “umbrella” mode absorption at 1232 cm$^{-1}$ and a polarization-independent rocking mode at 755 cm$^{-1}$. Well-ordered CH$_3$-Ge(111) surfaces displayed less surface charging while maintaining the low SRVs, indicating that such surfaces are successfully passivated.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Semiconductors

Ever since the development of crystal rectifiers for radar receivers in World War II, semiconductors have played an important role for over half a century in the form of electronics, and are expected to play a critical role in solar power generation.\textsuperscript{1,2} Semiconductor theory and technology were established with crystalline semiconductors such as silicon (Si) and germanium (Ge), the latter of which is the focus of this work.

The band structure described in the following sections is a result of electrons moving within a periodic potential, such as that induced by the crystal lattice.\textsuperscript{3} The periodicity of the bulk crystal cannot continue out past the physical surface, so there is necessarily a distortion of the crystal potential. Because the surface of the crystal is accessible to contact with other materials, the chemical composition at the surface may be quite different from that of the bulk. For this reason, knowledge and control
of the electronics and chemistry of the crystal surface is important for practical use of semiconductor devices.

1.1.2 Surface Potential

When a semiconductor is contacted with a conducting phase, there will be a net transfer of charge until the electrochemical potential of the materials are balanced by the electric potential of the field established at the interface. The conducting phase has a higher density of states than does the semiconductor within the bandgap, so while the charge on the conducting side is located at the interface, the charge in the semiconductor is distributed across a space charge region beneath the surface. The charge density of this region, and hence the width, is determined by the dopant concentration. For a uniform dopant density, it can be approximated that the dopant atoms are uniformly ionized and the carriers depleted to a certain depth. In the case of an n-type semiconductor brought into contact with a metal of lower chemical potential (higher work function), there will be a transfer of electrons to the metal so the metal surface has a negative charge, balanced by the positively charged immobile donor atoms in the semiconductor. This is depicted in Figure 1.1 on page 4. As a conduction band electron is brought to the interface, it is at a greater potential as it approaches the increasingly less-shielded negative charge on the metal. This is described by an approximation in Poisson’s equation

\[
\frac{\delta^2 V}{\delta x^2} = \frac{\delta E}{\delta x} \approx \frac{q}{\varepsilon_s} N_D
\] (1.1)
Integrating and eliminating $E$ yields the relationship between the depletion width $W$, the dopant density $N_D$, and the difference in potential between the two phases or built in potential $V_{bi}$

$$W = \sqrt{\frac{2\varepsilon_s V_{bi}}{qN_D}}$$

(1.2)

The current-voltage behavior of the rectifier is dependent upon the concentration of carriers at the surface and available to cross the interface. That surface concentration differs from that of the bulk in a manner governed by the built-in voltage

$$n_s = n_b \exp \left( \frac{-q(V_{bi} + V)}{kT} \right)$$

(1.3)

$$n_b = n_i \exp \left( \frac{-E_F + E_i}{kT} \right)$$

(1.4)

where $n_s$ is the surface electron concentration, and $n_b$ is the bulk electron concentration.

The simple model outlined above is complicated by the presence of surface-states. Electrically active surface-states alter the surface carrier concentrations, and the surface potential, by acting as carrier recombination or generation centers. The $V_{bi}$ of a junction is also altered as the surface states accept or donate charge during the initial equilibration. These effects of surface-states are often uncontrolled and undesirable, and the chemical identity of the surface-states is dependent upon the semiconductor material type. For this reason, chemical control of the surface is of critical importance.
Figure 1.1: Band-bending
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1.2 Silicon & Germanium

Covalent diamond-type semiconductors silicon and germanium are composed of a single element and may be melted and crystallized with a method first discovered by Czochralski for purifying metals.\(^4,5\) For this reason, high purity crystals have long been produced to a degree not easily achievable with compound semiconductors.\(^6\)

Although both Ge and Si have a diamond type crystal structure, reconstructed Si(111) and Ge(111) surfaces prepared in ultra-high vacuum (UHV) have different periodicity of surface atoms, resulting in different chemistries under such conditions. The bare Si(111) surface reconstructs to a \(7 \times 7\) unit cell.\(^7\) Under vacuum, bare Ge(111) tends to reconstruct to a \(c(2 \times 8)\), with two distinct surface atom types, adatoms and restatoms. Adatoms bond to three atoms of the first full atomic layer, occupying 3/4 of the surface bonds of that layer. The restatoms are the remaining 1/4 of the full layer atoms that do not bond to the adatoms.\(^8,9\) As confirmed by STM, charge transfer from the adatoms to the restatoms leads to filled and empty dangling bond types.\(^9,10\) Chemically passivated surfaces on both Si(111) and Ge(111), however, display the \(1 \times 1\) unit cell. The Ge lattice constant is approximately 4% larger than that of Si, so the distance between neighboring atop atoms of the \((111)\) \(1 \times 1\) surface is similar for both semiconductors (3.8 Å for Si(111) and 4.0 Å for Ge(111)) so that the two surfaces are geometrically comparable.\(^11,12\)

In the 1950s, Ge and Si were both major components of the developing solid-state electronics field. With the advent of the field effect transistor, however, Si became the dominant material, though Ge has continued to be used in special components for
microwave and infrared communications. Silicon oxide is a stable material that may be grown on the crystal surface to form a gate dielectric. Under proper conditions, the crystal/oxide interface can be formed with a minimal electronic defect density. Germanium oxide is water soluble and not stable under most relevant conditions, so that even if a low-defect crystal/oxide interface were to be formed it could not be maintained. For this reason, Si has been useful for technologies using field effect devices while germanium has been largely overshadowed.

In addition to electronics, Si is a dominant material in photovoltaics (PV). The use of crystalline Si for this purpose is in part due to the fact that there existed Si processing capabilities and technology developed for electronics. However, Si has other aspects that ensure that it will be an attractive PV material, even as the PV and electronics technologies diverge and world-wide PV module production outstrips the production of other electronic components. As a practical matter, Si is both non-toxic and abundant, so there is no inherent danger in its widespread use.

1.2.1 Germanium

Electronics

There has been recent interest in Ge for use in field effect transistors. As the number of transistors on an integrated circuit increases, and the power per transistor must necessarily decrease, the gate oxide has decreased to less than 1 nm, and due to both electron tunneling and physical defects in such a thin layer, leakage currents become significant. In order to use a sufficiently thick dielectric that the leakage
currents are avoided without sacrificing the electrical performance of the transistor, silicon oxide is replaced with a high-κ material such as hafnium oxide. With the removal of its oxide from the device architecture, Si no longer has this major advantage over Ge.

Ge possesses a hole carrier mobility that is four times that of the hole carrier mobility in Si, an advantage in high-speed circuits and of interest in CMOS technology where the p-channel component has traditionally had poorer performance. Although the processing of Ge is similar to Si, it can take place at lower temperatures. Ge has a melting point of 937°C versus 1414°C for Si.

**Light Absorption**

A semiconductor will absorb incident radiation at or above the energy of its bandgap. Photon energy in excess of the bandgap is usually lost as heat. Silicon’s 1.12 eV bandgap is also reasonably close to the 1.4 eV gap that would be ideal for efficient collection of sunlight, as represented by the AM 1.5 solar spectrum. If the bandgap were larger, much of the incident light would not be absorbed. If the gap were smaller, more would be absorbed but more of the energy wasted as heat rather than producing a voltage. At 0.67 eV, the bandgap of Ge is much too small to efficiently capture solar radiation for useful electricity. However, it can be a component in multijunction solar cells, depicted in Figure 1.2 on page 9, where the higher energy photons are first collected by a wide bandgap absorber. The remaining lower energy photons are collected by a second or third absorber. Multijunction cells are more complicated, and hence more expensive, than single absorber cells. But the
similarity in processing to that of Si, and the similarity in lattice parameters to GaAs (1.6 eV gap) indicate that the choice of Ge could mitigate some of the complexity.  

1.3 Summary

Ge has much to offer in the fields of electronics and photovoltaics and has enough similarities to Si that comparable passivation techniques may be applied. The research described herein concerns an attempt to passivate the defects through a wet chemical technique similar to that proven to be successful in passivating Si. Elemental analysis of the modified surfaces is performed with x-ray photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS). Structural analysis is performed with transmission infrared absorption spectroscopy (IRAS). Surface electronics are measured with combined surface recombination velocity (SRV) and low-frequency step-modulated field effect surface conductance measurements. Surface energetics are measured with n-Ge/Hg rectifying soft contacts.
Figure 1.2: Multijunction cell
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